REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of 04 February 2005. Claims 16-26 are pending in the application, and Claims 16-26 have been rejected.

By this response, Claim 19 has been cancelled, and Claims 16, 20 and 21 have been amended:

No new matter has been added.

In view of the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination.

About The Invention

The present invention relates generally to electronic documents, and more particularly relates to production and display of electronic documents in which text and script portions are exclusive from each other (i.e., segregated), and in which the script portion includes location dependent parameter identifiers along with location coordinates, which, together, direct various effects of the script to the specified location. In one further aspect of the present invention, the script portion (which excludes text, and includes location parameters) directs replacement of one or more elements of the text portion with predetermined other elements. In another further aspect of the present invention, the script portion and text portion are communicated, or transmitted, separately.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, first paragraph

Claims 16-26 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner alleges that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. More particularly, the Examiner states that the limitation "wherein providing the first text portion and the first script portion to an application that lacks a capability for formatting the first text portion in accordance with the first script portion results in the display of the first text portion" is not enabled by the specification.

Although Applicant has previously provided arguments traversing the rejections under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, and still maintains that the specification provides enablement for those rejected Claims, in the interest of furthering the prosecution of this case, independent Claim 16 has been amended as described more fully below.

Independent Claim 16 has been amended to provide alternative language for describing the limitations previously recited therein. More particularly, Claim 16 has been amended to replace the phrase "wherein providing the first text portion and the first script portion to an application that lacks a capability for formatting the first text portion in accordance with the first script portion results in the display of the first text portion" with the phrase "wherein rendering the electronic document by an application that displays the contents of a formatted file directly results in the display of the first text portion without the display of the script portion". Support for this amendment can generally be found throughout the specification, and can more particularly be found at page 7, lines 17-19.

This alternative language is clearly found in the specification as noted above. Further, this language expresses the essence of the previous limitation, i.e., when an application, such as a plain-text word processor that does not format the text in accordance with an associated script portion, is presented with the segregated text and script portions, only the text portion is displayed.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been overcome.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 16-26 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Freund, Jim ("HotDog Professional 5.1 Webmaster Suite: HotDog 5.1 Cuts the Mustard", 11/1998, Computer Shopper, Vol. 18, No. 11, pages 1-2) in view of Business Wire, "HotDog powers Web authors to new heights", 10/1996, pages 1-2), further in view of Powers, et al., (US Patent 6,362,817), and further in view of Simpson, Alan, "Mastering WordPerfect 5.1 and 5.2 for Windows", 1993, SYBEX Inc., pages 74-81, 108-109, 148-150, and 944-945.

Claim 19 has been cancelled, thereby rendering moot the rejection thereof.

Claims 20 and 21 have been amended to depend from Claim 16, rather than from cancelled Claim 19.

Independent Claim 16 has been amended to make clear that: providing the first text portion is done without displaying; providing the first script portion is done without displaying; and that the electronic document is such that when rendered by an application that displays the contents of a formatted file directly, the script portion is not displayed.

Claims 16-18 and 20-26 are directed to a method of producing an electronic document wherein various aspects of the present invention include providing separate text and script portions, each of those portions being exclusive of the other; the script portion including at least one location dependent parameter identifier, and that an electronic document is produced which, when the first text portion and the first script portion are provided to a legacy-type application that cannot interpret the script information, only the first text portion is displayed.

The Freund reference discloses an HTML editor and the display of a web page. The Freund reference does not disclose providing, without displaying, a first text portion exclusive of script as the Examiner suggests. Freund discloses an HTML compatible browser that can interpret the embedded control script to produce a displayed version of an electronic document. The "first text portion exclusive of script" that the examiner refers to is the result of displaying a document by a browser under the direction of embedded script commands. Such a display is not the same as Applicant's claimed method of producing an electronic document in which text and script are segregated. A formatted output display produced from a file that contains integrated text and script is not the same as, nor does it suggest or motivate, Applicant's claimed invention which requires providing, not displaying, two separate sections (i.e., text and script) which may then be provided to a program that does not interpret the script (i.e., a program that displays a formatted file directly) and thereby results in the display of the text portion.

Applicant's amended Claim 16 recites limitations which distinguish it from, and make it unobvious in view of the references. The claimed invention requires the

providing of text and script portions, which are exclusive of one another, and which are not simply the result of processing integrated text and script to produce a text only display, as is the case with the cited browsers and viewers. The cited references do not provide suggestion or motivation which would result in Applicant's claimed solution to the problem of presenting intermixed text and script to, for example, a legacy application which is capable of interpreting plain text but not capable of interpreting the formatting commands referred to as script.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention defined by amended Claim 16 is neither disclosed, suggested, or motivated, by Freund, Business Wire, Powers, and Simpson, whether taken singularly or in combination. In view thereof, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 16 has been overcome. Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 17-18 and 20-26, which depend directly or indirectly from amended independent Claim 16, have also been overcome.

Conclusion

All of the rejections in the Office Action of 04 February 2005 have been responded to, and Applicant respectfully submits that the pending Claims 16-26 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 18 March 2005

Hillsboro, Oregon

Raymond ¥. Werne

Reg. No. 34,752